

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ALBANY DIVISION**

BRADY TANNER *et al*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TPUSA, Inc.,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No.: 1:12-CV-33 (WLS)

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Petition for Attorney's Fee. (Doc. 65.) In their motion, Plaintiffs request \$17,495 in attorneys' fees for 52.4 hours spent litigating a motion to compel. Plaintiffs' affidavits discuss, in a general way, the amount of hours worked and the reasonableness of the hourly rate. The motion, however, does not include an itemized billing statement or any documentation to differentiate the type of hours worked. Plaintiffs' showing is deficient. Generally speaking,

[c]asual after-the-fact estimates of time expended on a case are insufficient to support an award of attorneys' fees. Attorneys who anticipate making a fee application must maintain contemporaneous, complete and standardized time records which accurately reflect the work done by each attorney.

Nat'l Ass'n of Concerned Veterans v. Sec'y of Defense, 675 F.2d 1319, 1327–28 (D.C. Cir. 1982). “[W]hile counsel is not required to record in great detail how each minute of his time was expended, counsel should at least ‘identify the general subject matter of his time expenditures.’ *NAACP v. City of Evergreen*, 812 F.2d 1332, 1337 (11th Cir. 1987) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 437 n.12 (1983)).

Plaintiffs' generalized fee request makes it impossible for the Court to evaluate the reasonableness of the hours requested. The motion is therefore **DENIED** without

prejudice. Plaintiffs may file an amended motion in compliance with the relevant law and rules no later than **Monday, October 7, 2013**.

SO ORDERED, this 23rd day of September 2013.

/s/ W. Louis Sands
THE HONORABLE W. LOUIS SANDS,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT